



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

first person is what we should expect, no doubt, but *seeketh* in the preceding line shows the same confusion as to person, which, besides, is not uncommon: compare "Good my Liege, I come: And I beseech you heare me, who professes My selfe your loyall Servant, your Physitian, Your most obedient Counsaillor: yet that dares Lesse appeare so," etc., "Winter's Tale," ii, 3, 52 ff. (Folio), where most modern editions read *profess* and *dare*. (*Hazard* would not by any means suit the sense.)

P. 101. SIMONDS attaches too much importance to the lines:

"I was unhappy, and that I prove,
To love above my poor degree."

("Alas! poor man," st. 7, p. 218).

"WYATT's position was not a base one," he says, "nor was his family of inferior rank," etc. He argues that the lines must therefore refer to ANNE BOLEYN. But this self-abasement is sometimes a mere convention. The most striking instance I remember is in the 'King's Quair,' where Venus says to the lover:

"And zit, considering the nakitnesse
Bothe of thy wit, thy persone, and thy myght,
It is no mach, of thyne vnworthynesse
To hir hie birth, estate, and beautee bryght:
Als like ze bene, as day is to the nyght;
Or sek-cloth is vnto fyne cremesye;
Or doken to the fresche dayeyse."

(St. 109, ed. SKEAT, p. 28; cf. st. 110).

In this case the lover was the King of Scotland; the lady, JOAN BEAUFORT, daughter of the Earl of SOMERSET.—P. III. "Ye old mule" (p. 148) can hardly be regarded as "expressive of the lover's feelings." It is merely WYATT's coarse handling of the disagreeable theme of HORACE's "Parcius junctas quatuor fenestras" (i, 25). Dr. SIMONDS is wrong in supposing that the epithet *mule* is "used only of a woman of degraded character." WYATT himself applies it to the ugly but apparently respectable widow of his third satire: "Let the old mule bite upon the bridle" (p. 93, ed. NOTT).

P. 134. "Brunet, that set my wealth in such a roar" (p. 6). Whatever we may think of this perplexing poem, the change of reading seems to have been with an eye to VIRGIL, Ecl. i, 32 ff.—P. 142. It is hardly probable that "the advent of the new system of COPENI-

CUS" made WYATT break off the "Song of Iopas." The way in which the poets clung to the Ptolemaic system of astronomy is well known. Besides, WYATT died in 1542 and the great work of COPERNICUS was not printed till 1543, though a prodromus had appeared in 1540. It is very doubtful if WYATT ever heard of the theory.—P. 137. The "Court of Love" is inadvertently spoken of as CHAUCER'S.¹³—P. 142. Dr. SIMONDS dismisses WYATT's satires with a very few words. COLLIER's article in the *Archaeologia* xxvi, 456, he does not mention.

GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE.

Harvard University, June, 1890.

BUCHHEIM'S JUNGFRAU VON ORLÉANS*

It is always pleasant to welcome another German classic annotated by Prof. BUCHHEIM's industrious pen. All teachers feel their indebtedness to him not only for the books themselves, but still more for doing so much toward the enlightenment of publishers' minds, and toward the doing away of the old tradition that a German classic may properly be used merely as material for drill in the language. He has brought nearer the day to which every lover of literature looks forward, when the great masters of thought and expression will not be put into the purgatory of schoolboy hands merely because they used their mother tongue. Such editions as the present one foster the appreciation of these masterpieces as literature, and the realization that, to read them with any profit, a student must bring to them a fairly easy command of the language—a command that can be gained to much better purpose from narrative prose. Therefore we regret that Professor BUCHHEIM has counteracted in part this tendency of his work, by providing so freely very elementary notes.

Certain grammatical difficulties and all peculiarities due to individual style, to the metrical form, or the imaginative contents, are proper

13. Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. v, p. 238 f.

* *German Classics, edited with English Notes*, etc., by C. A. BUCHHEIM, Ph. D., F. C. P., etc. Vol. x. SCHILLER'S 'Jungfrau von Orleans.' (Oxford; 1890.)

subjects for annotation. But to use GOETHE'S pregnant or SCHILLER'S musical lines to illustrate a principle of grammar or to increase a scholar's vocabulary, is a prostitution of genius that we wish were less common. The student that does not know that the present tense is often used in German where we use a future, should confine himself still to his HAUFF, HEYSE or FREYTAG; one who is ignorant that *cherubim* is the plural of *cherub*, or that "to mow down" is used of the slaughter on a battlefield, should study his mother tongue. We wish, moreover, that there was far less paraphrasing of lines and idioms; or, if that must be, would ask for more marked felicity in the renderings. We refer not so much to the phrases which an idiom renders obscure, as to many where the student can scarcely be in doubt as to the meaning, though it may be difficult for him to find a fit English equivalent. If such are to be translated, it should be in order to give in the English something at least of the poetic charm—of the *style*—of the original; and this Prof. BUCHHEIM does not often do. For example, *ins graulich düstre Geisterreich* (l. 87); as to the meaning of the phrase, a boy advanced enough to read SCHILLER'S dramas at all, will be involved in no perplexity that the lexicon will not clear up. To its poetic suggestiveness he may, to be sure, remain deaf; but his ears will hardly be unstopped by the rendering "into the fearfully gloomy realm of spirits," which is woefully feeble and commonplace.

And what is worse, the translation is often misleading, if not positively wrong.—*Heben* (l. 23) does not mean "remove" nor "lighten," but as usual 'lift.' In l. 43 it is surely unnecessary to read a future meaning into *Hochzeit machen*, unless the present is to be limited to the passing instant; say, "are getting married." *Was Höheres zu bedeuten* (l. 78) is ill-represented by "to be some lofty being" (which is the thought of the next line); it is simply: 'to have a loftier significance.' Why lose the poetic *grau* (l. 97) from *der grauen Heidenzeit*? "Ancient" is both tame and inexact. *Segenreich* (l. 109) is not "blissful" but 'blessed.' In line 215 there is surely a clear and sound distinction between *dunkelnd* and *dunkel*.—Since *Mannen* (l. 225) "means

'vassals,' " why "say 'warriors' "? *Dipn* (l. 328) has *not* the "more dignified sense of the word," nor is it to be rendered "maiden." The father is speaking somewhat contemptuously of his child's exalted mood and calls her 'wench,' 'girl.'

The list of such errors could easily be lengthened. Of more serious blunders we have few to note.—The emphatic position of *wohl* (l. 195) seems to bar the sense 'indeed'; *wohl* is to be connected with the verb.—In 203 we must still prefer to take *bedeckt* as the participle, with the auxiliary omitted.—*Was* (l. 254) is ill-explained by saying it is "often used in the sense of 'those.' " In 642 *nach deiner Krone* ("for the benefit of thy crown") is wholly misunderstood. Agnes is telling him to cast everything "after his crown," which is to be understood as having gone with the other *überfluss'gen Schmuck des Lebens*, that is, as having been exchanged for soldiers.

The historical and critical introductions are full, and well adapted to the learner's needs. The crux of the drama—the scene with the Black Knight (iii, 9), and in conjunction with it the Lionel episode—is briefly discussed, but, as it seems to us, the deeper significance of the scene and its importance as a turning-point in the subjective progress of the drama, is overlooked. SCHILLER strikes here the keynote of all that follows. One may perhaps doubt the propriety of grafting a drama of subjective character on one, up to this point, so purely objective in its interest; but if it is to be done, some such interlude, calling attention (as a Chorus might do) to the transference of interest from the external to the internal world, to the moral significance of the succeeding incidents, is in place. The scene may well have been suggested by iv. 3, of "Julius Cæsar," where the ghost of Cæsar appears to Brutus as his "evil spirit." Joan had no past that could furnish her the embodiment in visual form of her "evil spirit"; her apparition is her lower self—a self that has been overwhelmed and lost in the flood of her inspiration, but which, taking courage from the approaching temptation to earthly love, gains audience in the shape of vague distrust and dread of the future. The scene serves a twofold purpose. It marks (1) the transference of the real drama

from the stage of history to that of the individual soul; it is the prologue of the character-tragedy whose course SCHILLER traces in the rest of the play. And (2) it immediately prefaces the succeeding scene with Lionel, suggesting in symbolic form the human love which there lays hold on her, and which is the germ of her bitter self-reproach and of the tragic conflict. Line 2482 puts in words the curse which falls on her, symbolized again by Lionel's bearing away with him her consecrated sword. Thenceforth the dramatic interest hinges on Joan's consciousness of faithlessness to her mission in admitting human love to her soul. The Black Knight is her Evil Self and her Fate in one.

The unfamiliarity of the average student with history might have warranted reference, in more definite shape than foot-notes or incidental allusion, to books in English or in French which deal with the epoch. A list of such books and essays would have been useful. One of the most sympathetic, subtle and—for all its simplicity—profound estimates of Joan of Arc, and incidentally the most luminous commentary on the character as SCHILLER conceived it, is to be found in SAINTE-BEUVE'S 'Causerie du lundi' (19 août, 1850).

A. B. NICHOLS.

Harvard University.

ROMANCE VERSIFICATION.

Über den Ursprung der romanischen Versmasse. Habilitationsschrift vorgelegt der philosophischen Facultät der Albrecht-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, von PH. AUG. BECKER. Strassburg: Trübner. 1890. 8vo, pp. iv, 54.

Essai comparatif sur l'origine et l'histoire des rythmes par MAXIMILIEN KAWCZYNSKI. Paris: Bouillon. 1889. 8vo, pp. 220.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since the origin of Romance versification was made the subject of investigation by MM. LÉON GAUTIER and GASTON PARIS. The interchange of views which took place at that time remained without important additions up to the appearance of a new generation of philologists. General interest in the question was renewed by the studies of W. MEYER (of

Speyer) on the prevalence of accent in classical Latin poetry and on the origin of Latin and Greek rhythmical poetry (in the Proceedings of the Munich Academy, 1882-1886). Following MEYER came the papers of V. HENRY ('Des origines du décasyllable.' Paris, 1886) and of R. THURNESEN (*Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.* vol. xi, p. 306 ss.) on the Latin type of the French decasyllable. To prove the whole by a part, or to assume a model in Latin for each Romance verse, was not only hazardous for general conclusions, but also limited unnecessarily the range of arguments to be employed. It was necessary, therefore, to take the whole field under survey, to adduce all supporting proofs which it contained, and consequently to treat Romance versification as a system derived as a whole from some previous system of verse. This is the object of Dr. BECKER'S article.

The starting point of such an investigation must be entirely theoretical. It is not possible to trace back the poetry of the Middle Ages to the source of its versification, owing to the fact that when vernacular poetry appeared, at least as we have it in the manuscripts, it was already fixed so far as its structure was concerned. The general features also were the same in each Romance country, and these leave little ground for belief that the origin of the system is to be found elsewhere than in Latin poetry existing before the rise of Romance. The theory proposed by M. GAUTIER was that Romance poetry is derived from Latin rhythmical poetry, and that each Latin rhythmical verse represents a corresponding Latin metrical verse. To which M. PARIS¹ replied that Romance versification is derived from the rhythmical verse of the Latins, but that the origin of Latin rhythmical poetry is wholly popular and has nothing to do with the literary metre—which it indeed afterwards corrupted.²

BECKER in his Introduction enters immediately on this mooted problem. He assumes

1. This is not at present the opinion of M. PARIS, and a statement of the changes his views have undergone will be awaited with interest.

2 M. PAUL MEYER, in a course of lectures on Romance versification given in 1885 at the Collège de France, summed up his position on this point as follows: "La poésie rythmique n'est pas la mère du vers roman mais sa soeur aînée."